

## REMARKS

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to several informalities in the specification. Those informalities have been corrected herein so it is believed the objections to the specification can be withdrawn.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge allowance of claims 37-47 in paragraph 11 of the office action.

In paragraph 2 of the office action, claims 14 and 32 were objected to because the word "inset" should be "insert." The Examiner also objected to claims 14 and 32 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 14 and 32 have been cancelled and resubmitted in independent form as new claims 48 and 49, respectively. The typographical error was corrected in these new claims, so it is believed they are now in condition for allowance.

In paragraph 4 of the office action claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention because the phrase "defined between the housing adjacent to the cover" is unclear. Claim 11 has been amended to clarify that the second opening is between the housing and cover. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

In paragraph 5 of the office action the Examiner has rejected claims 1-10, 13, 15, 17, 19-29, 31, 33, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Edwards, et al. The Examiner stated:

The embodiment of Figs. 1-7 of Edwards include a housing 20, cover 70, a cylindrical reel portion 30 have a first cord portion 12a wrapped therearound and

a second cord portion 12c within the interior of the cylindrical reel portion, the second cord portion being wrapped in coil form in the same and different directions depending on the amount of cord 12a being unwound, ... . The first cord portion extends out opening 15 tangential to the housing and the second cord portion extends out opening 19 in the cover 70. The planes of the cord portions extending out of the housing and cover are perpendicular to one another.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Edwards does not disclose a specific feature of the claimed invention, namely a first portion of a wire around a cylindrical portion of a reel, a second portion of the wire inside the cylindrical portion of the reel, and a 180° bend in the wire interconnecting the first and second portions of the wire. This is not shown in FIGS. 5B or 7 of Edwards, and therefore, this reference cannot be used as a basis for rejecting claims having this feature under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Another feature not shown in Edwards is a flat wire wrapped in first and second directions.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of a 180° bend, originally a limitation of claim 4. Claim 4 has been amended to include the limitation of a flat wire. Claims 8, 10 and 15 have been amended for clarity. In view of these amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10, 13, 15 and 17 should be allowed.

Claim 19 has been amended to include the limitation of a cover insert, and therefore, the rejection of claims 19-28, 31, 33 and 35 is now moot. Claim 27 has been amended for clarity. Because the Examiner has already indicated that claims with the limitation of the cover insert are allowable if submitted in independent form (objected-to claims 14 and 32), it is believed that amended claim 19 and claims 20-28, 31, 33 and 35 depending therefrom should also be allowable.

In paragraph 7 of the office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 16 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Benner, stating it would be obvious to add the cleaning brush device of Benner to the apparatus of Edwards. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

All of the previous arguments and comments presented with respect to amended claims 1 and 19 also apply to claims 16 and 34. Therefore, claims 16 and 34 should be allowable.

In paragraph 8 of the office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 18 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Ellis, stating it would be obvious to add the mounting lugs of Ellis to the apparatus of Edwards. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Again, all of the previous arguments and comments regarding amended claims 1 and 19 also apply to claims 18 and 36. Therefore, claims 18 and 36 should be allowable.

In paragraph 9 of the office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 11, 12, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Burke. The Examiner stated:

Burke discloses a similar spring reel cord device in which the second cord portion extends out from an opening between the housing and cover, note the cord portion 46 extending out an opening between cover 32 and housing portion 62, Fig. 4. It would have been obvious to provide the device of Edwards et al with an opening for the second cord portion between the housing and cover in view of the teaching of Burke. Such a modification would have been obvious since the second cord portion may need to be situated at a different location relative to the opening for the first cord portion for attachment to similarly mounted external device, such as a cell phone.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Initially, all of the previous arguments and comments regarding amended claims 1 and 19 also apply to claims 11, 12, 29 and 30. Therefore, these claims should be allowable for these reasons alone.

Further, Burke does not show the features claimed. Element 32 is a wall of housing 14, not a cover. Element 62 is identified as a cover. Regardless of the nomenclature, the opening through which end 46 of cord 12 extends is defined solely by housing 14. End 46 also apparently extends through an adjacent opening in cover 62. However, neither of these openings is defined *between* the housing and cover as claimed, and thus, no combination of Edwards and Burke results in an apparatus having such a feature. Therefore, in view of these arguments and the above-referenced amendment to claim 11, claims 11, 12, 29 and 30 should be allowed.

New claims 50-64 have been added. These new claims are believed to be allowable.

### Summary

The specification has been amended to overcome the objections cited by the Examiner.

Claims 37-47 have been allowed.

Claims 14 and 32 have been cancelled and resubmitted in independent form as new claims 48 and 49, respectively. Therefore, claims 48 and 49 are allowable.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, 19 and 27 have been amended. In view of these amendments and the arguments presented, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-13, 15-31 and 33-36 are now in condition for allowance.

New claims 50-64 have been added and are also believed to be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. LaBrie  
Registration No. 39,507  
McAfee & Taft  
Tenth Floor, Two Leadership Square  
211 North Robinson  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102  
Telephone: (405) 235-9621  
Facsimile: (405) 235-0439  
E-Mail: [michael.labrie@mcafeetaft.com](mailto:michael.labrie@mcafeetaft.com)

Attorney for Applicants